DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 444 SP 013 175

AUTHOR Berry, Charles A.
TITLE Inservice Education Programs; Current and Predicted as Viewed by Selected Principals and Superintendents.
INSTITUTION Grambling State Univ., La.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 18p.; Light type may not reproduce clearly

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Factor Analysis; Futures (of Society); Inservice Education; *Inservice Programs; *Needs Assessment; *Prediction; *Principals; *Program Development; Questionnaires; *Superintendents

ABSTRACT

Two sets of administrators (principals and superintendents) were asked if selected inservice education programs were being implemented currently in the respondents' schools and school systems and, secondly, what their perceptions were of the need for selected inservice education programs in the next five years. The study requested responses of a priority ranking to the need for each of 26 inservice education programs during the next five years. An indication of which of the 26 programs was currently being offered in a school or school system was also requested. Responses of the principals showed a greater frequency for those programs mandated by law as well as some of those which represented the concerns of the public. Both principals and superintendents anticipated a need to continue the current programs and placed low priority on programs that would focus on greater personal-social-career development of pupils. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164444

INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS - CURRENT AND PREDICTED AS VIEWED BY SELECTED PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS

C. A. Berry
Professor of Education

Grambling State University Grambling, Louisiana

May, 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles A. Berry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

INTRODUCTION

As a result of many factors and forces impinging upon the public school establishment, there has been a noticeable upsurge during the past decade in the number, frequency and diversity of inservice education programs for teachers. Bold indicators would suggest that the momentum will increase. While it is true that many programs were self-induced by members of the establishment, it is no less true that the provocation for some arose outside the establishment. The sensing of the need for such programs or the acquiescence to the demands by school personnel for such programs has resulted in some instances in state statutes[1] and in other instances simply in provisions by school boards for teachers to be paid while participating in inservice programs. The latter has taken the form of designated days prior to the "opening of school;" truncated school days allowing for a part of the regular school day to be used for inservice education, and evenings and Saturdays used for inservice education.

School systems and their personnel attempting to respond to newer challenges and demands see inservice education as a productive vehicle. Increasingly federal and state programs and mandates are determining and dictating the character and content of inservice education programs. Thus, an examination of the variety of operative programs will reveal some that are dictated by the need for education personnel to become prepared to

---

[1]For example, Act 612, Louisiana Legislature, 1975 and Act 10, Louisiana Legislature, 1977 mandated a two-day instructional Workshop for all public school teachers, with the stipulation that $500 increase in salary was permissible only if the teacher attended both days of the two-day Workshop.

respond immediately, effectively and in some instances prescriptively to external legal demands. Of note for example, are the "Accountability Acts" (Louisiana), "Title IX, Compliance" (Federal) and Education of All Handicapped Children Act—P. L. 94-142 (Federal). At the same time, Congressional and Louisiana Legislative behaviors as delineated in acts and resolutions involving Career Education, Drug Education, Improving Reading Skills, and the Metric System convey unmistakeably to school systems and their personnel the mood and orientation of these legal bodies.

Many inservice programs evolve from the perceived needs of teachers and the problems of a particular school or school system in its efforts to educate better the attending pupils. Such programs run the gamut from "Working with Problem Pupils" to "Improving Scheduling" to effectuating more wholesome and productive "School-Parent-Community Relations." Irrespective to the generative force(s) which might have initiated the inservice education program, its raison d'être is the improvement in living and learning of the pupils that attend the school. Thus, it is conceivable that inservice education of some type will continue to attend the future operation of the public school establishment.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This research purported to first determine from two sets of administrators (principals and superintendents) if selected inservice education programs were being implemented currently in the respondents' schools and school systems and secondly their perceptions of the need for selected inservice education programs in the next five years. In consequence of the first two purposes, an evolved third purpose was to project from the priority ranking of the need for each inservice program the

continuity of current inservice programs. The fulfillment of the three purposes might then enable the investigator to draw some tentative conclusions.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

As suggested in the Introduction, many factors-some real and some imagined- confluently determine the nature and focus of inservice education programs. The literature prepared by and for professional educators increasingly reports on multifarious inservice education programs. Reports of funded grants and projects ofttime carry information regarding inservice education programs inherent in the grants and projects. Visitations to schools and discussions with the practicing professionals frequently provide information regarding inservice education programs. From the above sources, in the main, an original list of 37 inservice programs was prepared by the investigator. In refining the list to minimize duplication and to assure specificity of programs, a final list of 26 inservice education programs was developed and used in the study.

The final form employed in the study requested responses of a priority ranking to the need for each of 26 inservice education programs during the next five years. Also, the form requested a response indicating which of the 26 inservice education programs was currently being offered in a school (if the principal was the respondent) or in a school(s) in a school system (if the superintendent was the respondent).

During the month of September, 1977, each of the 66 public school superintendents in the State of Louisiana was written a letter in which the superintendent was asked to cooperate in the study and to complete the form that was enclosed. No follow-up request was sent, thus the data

include the responses of 36 superintendents to the single request. Also, a letter and form were sent to 49 principals of schools in which student teachers from Grambling State University were assigned the first semester, 1977-78. Again, no follow-up request was made and the data are the responses of 35 principals to the sole letter and form.

To test the notion that the currency of inservice education programs and priority ranking of projected need during the next five years might be related to the grade level organization of the school and the number of schools in the school system, the investigator categorized the data from the respondents as below:

Principals		Superintendents	
Type of School	No. of Responses	No. of Schools in System	No. of Superintendents
K- 8	16	4- 10	7
9-12	8	11- 19	15
K-12	11	20- 44	8
		45-141	6
Total	35	Total	36

For each of the groups and sub-groups above, means of priority ranks assigned the inservice education programs were calculated and the resultant means were ranked. Tables were developed showing the mean ranks. Pearsonian coefficients of correlation were calculated.

Tables were developed depicting the frequency of current implementation of each of the inservice education programs by group and sub-group listed above. A Pearsonian correlation as coefficient was derived for the total responses of principals and superintendents. Correlation of coefficients were calculated for (1) mean ranking by principals of need for inservice education programs in the next five years and the responses to current implementation of the programs. A similar treatment of these two variables

was performed on the responses from superintendents. Finally, from the findings of the investigation, conclusions were drawn.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Responses from the 35 principals were categorized according to the grade levels offered at the school. Table I shows the responses of principals on the current implementation of the 26 inservice education programs.

Table I. Frequency of Current Implementation of Inservice Education Programs in 35 Schools, by Type of Grade Level Organization.

Inservice Education Program	Grade Level Organization			
	K-8 N=16	9-12 N=8	K-12 N=11	Total N=35
Career Education	7	3	3	13
Behavior Modification	6	3	1	10
Drug Education	4	2	1	7
Creative Problem Solving	3	2	0	5
Values Clarification	0	0	0	0
Movement Education	0	0	0	0
Metric System	7	2	1	10
Management by Objectives	2	2	1	5
Educational Accountability	8	2	4	14
Fine Arts	3	0	0	3
Curriculum Environmental Learning	2	0	0	2
Performance Objectives	8	0	2	10
Staff Assessment	7	2	1	10
Language Arts (Reading, English, etc.)	6	2	2	10
Scheduling (traditional and variable)	3	0	2	5
Humanizing Education	3	1	0	4
Sex-role Stereotyping	1	0	0	1
Working with Problem Pupils	4	1	0	5
Testing and Measurements	3	0	1	4
Strategies for Individualizing Education	3	1	0	4
Learning Disabilities	8	2	0	10
Curriculum Development	3	1	0	4
Classroom Management	2	0	0	2
School-Parent-Community	7	3	1	11
Title IX Compliance	8	5	4	17
Section 504, P. L. 94-142	9	4	4	17

None of the schools were implementing programs in "Values Clarification"

and "Movement Education." Also, seven other programs were not being implemented in any of the eight 9-12 schools and ten other programs were not being implemented in the eleven K-12 schools. Generally, the incidence of implementing the programs was greatest in the group of K-8 schools. At least 50 percent of the K-8 schools were implementing programs in "Educational Accountability," "Performance Objectives," "Learning Disabilities," "Title IX Compliance," and "Sections 504, P. L. 94-142." Of note in Table I is that none of the K-12 schools were implementing programs in "Classroom Management," "Curriculum Development," and "Working with Problem Pupils." Only one of the eleven K-12 schools had a program in "School-Parent-Community."

Although no school offered as many as 50 percent of the listed programs, those programs related to State and National legal statute were offered more frequently by the schools. For example, 14 of the schools had programs in "Educational Accountability" while 17 had programs in "Title IX Compliance" and "Section 504, P. L. 94-142."

The responses from the superintendents indicated whether an inservice education program was being offered in at least one of the schools in the school system. Seven of the inservice education programs were being offered in schools in 15 or more school systems. The programs in "Educational Accountability," "Title IX Compliance," and "Section 504, P. L. 94-142" are imbedded in legal statute. The data in Table II shows that the percentage frequency of implementing the programs in the small school systems (4-10 schools) was significantly less than in the other three categories. Five of the six school superintendents with 45-141 schools in the system reported programs in "School-Parent-Community" and "Learning Disabilities" and seven of the superintendents of systems with 20-44 schools reported programs in "Educational Accountability." Only one superintendent reported

Table II. Frequency of Current Implementation of Inservice Education Programs in 36 School Systems, by Number of Schools in the System.

Inservice Education Program	Number of Schools in System				
	4-10 N=7	11-19 N=15	20-44 N=8	45-141 N=6	Total N=36
Career Education	2	7	3	2	14
Behavior Modification	0	3	3	2	8
Drug Education	0	6	3	3	12
Creative Problem Solving	0	4	0	0	4
Values Clarification	0	3	1	1	5
Movement Education	0	4	1	2	7
Metric System	2	6	5	2	15
Management by Objectives	0	5	4	3	12
Educational Accountability	4	8	7	4	23
Fine Arts	0	2	3	1	6
Curriculum Environmental Learning	0	0	0	1	1
Performance Objectives	1	6	4	2	13
Staff Assessment	2	7	5	3	17
Language Arts (Reading, English, etc.)	0	6	4	4	14
Scheduling (traditional and variable)	0	3	2	1	6
Humanizing Education	0	1	1	0	2
Sex-role Stereotyping	0	2	0	0	2
Working with Problem Pupils	0	7	1	1	9
Testing and Measurements	2	4	3	2	11
Strategies for Individualizing Education	3	6	4	2	15
Learning Disabilities	2	8	2	5	17
Curriculum Development	2	3	4	3	12
Classroom Management	2	1	2	2	7
School-Parent-Community	1	4	1	5	11
Title IX Compliance	3	8	3	4	18
Section 504, P. L. 94-142	4	10	5	4	23

a program in "Curriculum Environmental Learning" and only two reported programs in "Humanizing Education" and "Sex-role Stereotyping."

A coefficient of correlation of .805 was derived between the total responses of principals for implemented programs and the total responses of superintendents for implemented programs. The coefficient was significant beyond the one percent level of confidence.[1]

[1]The coefficient of correlation, although not spurious, has less than clear meaning in this instance because some of the schools reported by some of the principals could well have been some of the schools reported by some of the superintendents.

The research attempted to determine the projections of principals and superintendents of the need for the 26 designated inservice education programs during the next five years. Principals and superintendents were asked to rank each program on an anticipated need scale from 1-5. The mean of the ranks assigned to each of the programs was calculated and the investigator ranked the resultant means. Table III presents the ranking of means by grade level organization of the schools.

Table III. Principals' Priority Ranking by Type of Grade Level Organization of the Need for Inservice Education Programs During the Next Five Years, By Type of Grade Level Organization

Inservice Education Program	Grade Level Organization		
	K-8 N=16	9-12 N=8	K-12 N=11
Career Education	23.0	16.0	22.0
Behavior Modification	19.5	9.5	7.0
Drug Education	25.5	14.5	11.0
Creative Problem Solving	10.0	11.5	18.5
Values Clarification	13.0	11.5	6.0
Movement Education	24.5	23.0	21.0
Metric System	4.5	23.0	20.0
Management by Objectives	18.0	20.0	10.0
Educational Accountability	1.0	9.5	1.0
Fine Arts	11.0	25.0	25.0
Curriculum Environmental Learning	16.5	26.0	25.0
Performance Objectives	8.0	17.0	9.0
Staff Assessment	9.0	7.0	2.0
Language Arts (Reading, English, etc.)	2.5	11.5	3.0
Scheduling (traditional and variable)	19.5	14.5	18.5
Humanizing Education	6.0	18.5	8.0
Sex-role Stereotyping	25.5	23.0	25.0
Working with Problem Pupils	7.0	4.5	17.0
Testing and Measurements	22.0	21.0	12.5
Strategies for Individualizing Education	21.0	18.5	5.0
Learning Disabilities	2.5	7.0	23.0
Curriculum Development	12.0	4.5	12.5
Classroom Management	4.5	3.0	4.0
School-Parent-Community	14.0	7.0	14.5
Title IX Compliance	16.5	1.0	16.0
Section 504, P. L. 94-142	15.0	2.0	14.5

The differences among ranks for the inservice education programs is readily

noticeable. With the exceptions of "Movement Education," "Scheduling," "Sex-role Stereotyping," and "Classroom Management," the differences among the mean ranks for a given program are quite noticeable. Differences between mean ranks for some programs for K-8 and K-12 school categories readily stand out and probably were related to unique factors of a geographic/demographic nature. For example, "Strategies for Individualizing Education" and "Learning Disabilities" ranked low and high respectively for K-8 schools and the opposite for K-12 schools. "Working with Problem Pupils" ranked seventh for K-8 schools and 17 for K-12 schools.

"Educational Accountability" ranked nine and a half for 9-12 schools, but ranked first for each of the other two groups. "Title IX Compliance" and "Section 504, P. L. 94-142" ranked first and second for 9-12 schools, but significantly lower for the other two types of schools.

The correlation of coefficient between ranks for K-8 and 9-12 schools was .291; for 9-12 and K-12 schools .251 and K-8 and K-12 schools .427 (statistically significant).

Table IV presents the intercorrelations among mean priority ranks assigned by the superintendents to the need for the inservice education programs during the next five years.

Table IV. Intercorrelations Among Mean Priority Ranks Assigned by the Superintendents to the Need for the Inservice Education Program.

Schools in System	Number of Schools in System		
	11 - 19	20 - 44	45 - 141
4 - 10	.640**	.296	.358
11 - 19		.185	.427*
20 - 44			.185

**Significant at the one percent level of confidence
*Significant at the five percent level of conficence

According to the correlation coefficients in Table IV, the highest relationship existed among the ranked means for the schools in the smaller school systems (4-10 and 11-19). The significance of the correlation coefficients in Table IV is that they reflect the thinking of an administrator of a school system rather than the thinking of the administrator of a particular school.

The differences in the mean rankings as listed in Table V by these system administrative leaders as regards the need for inservice education

Table V. Superintendents' Priority Ranking by Number of Schools in the System of the Need for Inservice Education Programs in the Next Five Years.

	Number of Schools in System			
	4-10 N=7	11-19 N=15	20-44 N=8	45-141 N=6
Career Education	14.5	18.0	23.0	26.0
Behavior Modification	20.0	17.0	12.0	9.5
Drug Education	14.5	15.0	13.5	13.0
Creative Problem Solving	17.5	22.5	15.0	18.5
Values Clarification	19.0	16.0	3.5	16.0
Movement Education	4.0	21.0	22.0	18.5
Metric System	14.5	3.5	3.5	6.0
Management by Objectives	5.0	11.0	2.0	24.0
Educational Accountability	2.0	1.0	13.5	2.0
Fine Arts	21.0	20.0	26.0	20.5
Curriculum Environmental Learning	23.0	19.0	8.5	13.0
Performance Objectives	17.6	5.0	8.5	25.0
Staff Assessment	3.0	3.5	10.0	13.0
Language Arts (Reading, English, etc.)	8.5	2.0	24.0	13.0
Scheduling (traditional and variable)	24.0	26.0	6.0	22.0
Humanizing Education	25.5	22.5	16.5	20.5
Sex-role Stereotyping	25.5	25.0	16.5	23.0
Working with Problem Pupils	11.5	12.0	18.5	4.0
Testing and Measurements	1.0	14.0	7.0	8.0
Strategies for Individualizing Education	22.0	13.0	18.5	13.0
Learning Disabilities	8.5	8.0	11.0	9.5
Curriculum Development	6.0	9.0	5.0	4.0
Classroom Management	8.5	10.0	20.5	17.0
School-Parent-Community	11.5	6.5	25.0	4.0
Title IX Compliance	14.5	24.0	20.5	7.0
Section 504, P. L. 94-142	8.5	6.5	1.0	1.0

programs related to State and National law ("Educational Accountability," "Title IX Compliance" and "Section 504, P. L. 94-142,") is apparently as great as their differences regarding programs that, while not necessarily related to law, are related to the "moods" of citizens (State and National), such as "Career Education," "Metric System," "Management by Objective," "Performance Objective," "Language Arts," and "Classroom Management."

The investigator calculated the mean rankings of the need during the next five years for inservice programs assigned by all (35) principals and assigned by all (36) superintendents. The derived Pearsonian Correlation of Coefficient was .574 (very significant). Of note, however in Table VI

Table VI. Priority Ranking by Principals and Superintendents of the Need for Inservice Education Programs in the Next Five Years.

Inservice Education Program	Principals N=35	Superintendents N=36
Career Education	22.5	21.0
Behavior Modification	13.0	17.0
Drug Education	20.0	16.0
Creative Problem Solving	15.0	22.0
Values Clarification	11.5	14.0
Movement Education	25.0	19.0
Metric System	16.0	2.0
Management by Objectives	17.5	6.0
Educational Accountability	1.0	1.0
Fine Arts	21.0	20.0
Curriculum Environmental Learning	24.0	18.0
Performance Objectives	7.0	13.0
Staff Assessment	2.0	4.0
Language Arts (Reading, English, etc.)	4.0	9.0
Scheduling (traditional and variable)	19.0	24.0
Humanizing Education	7.0	25.0
Sex-role Stereotyping	26.0	26.0
Working with Problem Pupils	5.0	10.0
Testing and Measurements	22.5	7.0
Strategies for Individualizing Education	17.5	15.0
Learning Disabilities	10.0	8.0
Curriculum Development	11.5	5.0
Classroom Management	3.0	12.0
School-Parent-Community	14.0	11.0
Title IX Compliance	7.0	23.0
Section 504, P. L. 94-142	9.0	3.0

are the differences in the mean priority ranks between superintendents and principals for inservice education programs in the "Metric System," "Management by Objectives," and "Testing and Measurements," and their mean priority ranks for "Humanizing Education" and "Title IX Compliance." Although there was unanimity of agreement regarding "Educational Accountability" (couched in Louisiana Statute), there was substantial disagreement on "Title IX Compliance" and "Section 504, P. L. 94-142" (couched in Federal Statute).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study, utilizing a questionnaire/rating scale developed by the author, attempted to solicit from two groups of public school personnel-principals and superintendents-responses regarding the current implementation of selected inservice education programs in their schools/school systems and their projections of the need for these programs during the next five years. While the principals' responses on current implementation referred to a specific school, those of the superintendents reflected whether a particular inservice education program was being carried out in any school in the system. Thus, the responses of the superintendents did not reflect necessarily a system-wide program of implementation.

The responses of the principals as a group or when trichotomized by grade level organization of school, revealed wide variation in the currency of implementation of the selected programs. However, there was greater frequency for those programs mandated by law-whether federal or state-as well as some of those which represented the concerns of the public. To be noted among the less frequently implemented are those programs that are personally and socially developmental in nature, e.g., "Values Clarification,"

"Sex-role Stereotyping", "Fine Arts," and "Humanizing Education." Likewise, principals' projections of the need for programs in the next five years reflected more the apparent non-resolution of the needs/problems precipitative of current programs than an urgency to attack/resolve needs/problems inherent in other listed inservice education programs.

The superintendents, whether viewed as a group or as sub-groups according to the number of schools they superintended, differed substantially in what they foresaw as needed inservice education programs in the next five years. They, too anticipated a need to continue the current programs and placed low priority on programs that would focus on greater personal-social-career development of pupils. They ranked "Curriculum Development" rather high and "Scheduling" and "Career Development" rather low.

The samples (35 principals and 36 superintendents) might or might not have been representative of the State of Louisiana and the responses of the samples might or might not have been representative of the principals and superintendents in the State of Louisiana. Nevertheless, the investigator was disposed to attempt to tease out of the findings some conclusions and implications which were probably impregnable with notions held by the investigator.

1. Whether federal and state laws portend the need for staff development via inservice education programs or are the result of such need, there is a tendency to have such programs and the corollary anticipation of such programs concurrent/congruent with such laws.

2. Few inservice education programs can be so designed that they focus on a single, discreet problem, e.g., "Educational Accountability." Most programs, e.g., "Educational Accountability" must give ample attention to "Management by Objectives," "Performance Objectives," "Staff Assessment," and "Strategizing for Individualized Instruction." Apparently, this was not true in these schools/systems according to the responses of the participants in the study or they neglected to respond according to their discernment.

3. Public school educational leadership must be sensitively attuned, sagacious and risk-taking. The lack of such leadership behavior has forced it historically to adopt a reactive posture. To do what the law demands does not require educational statesmanship. To focus in an organized inservice education program upon the moral conscience of society does. "Values Clarification," "Sex-role Stereotyping" and "Humanizing Education" are not just professional issues and concerns, they are moral issues--issues that the public school system has so benignly neglected. Their continued neglect cannot but help accentuate their results--drugs and alcoholism, adolescent unmarried parenthood, school dropout, a weakened work ethic, and a general parasitic attitude and orientation-all among those whom the school is designed to serve. As important as are the current curriculum concerns and their appropriateness as programs for inservice education, such programs are more reactive than proactive. The question still persists, "Dare the Schools to . . ."

4. The need for, the nature of, and focus of staff development and inservice education programs in the public school are related to the preservice preparation of teachers. They speak either to the need for a career-long process of preparing teachers or to the ineptitude of university preservice education (a point held by even some friends of university based preservice teacher education programs), or both.

5. One of the current criticisms is that extended deperation and lack of positive action by those who might act, frequently lead to mandatory statutes being effected. A criticism of legislative behavior is that it ofttimes is a long drawn-out process. As regard education bills, there are frequent hearings, publication in the register, etc. This means that a substantial period of time might elapse between the prefiling or filing of a bill and the final passage of the bill in whatever the form. To the extent that the above are true, to that extent does the teacher preparing unit at the university have time to analyze the process/content of preparing teachers and to make the necessary changes. Whatever are the needs, problems and concerns in schools, those who prepare personnel to work in the schools should be among the first-certainly before legislators-to know and accordingly should effectuate the necessary changes in the teacher preparation programs so that the graduates will be the resolvers rather than clients in need of instant further development.

6. Preservice teacher education, like the postal service, in the thinking of many, is a national disaster. The greater the need for inservice education, the lower the credibility of university preservice teacher education. Whatever is the status of preservice teacher education, the determinants are internal and external. Programs and the utilization of resources and professional human expertise at the university are directed in the main to meet teacher licensure-a high and demanded priority. The rules and regulations and sometimes laws controlling the educational preparatory enterprise need not address necessarily the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed by the preservice students so that

as graduates they can function effectively in the schools. For years, lip service has been given to the school's responsibility to meet pupil/societal needs. A priority in organizing and implementing a preservice education program to prepare educational personnel to meet the above noble purpose is initially to fulfill licensure requirements. A valid question is whether there is always congruity. The restrictions necessarily incumbent in meeting licensure requirements might serve to hinder or at least minimize the effective organizing and implementing of a preservice teacher education program that would lessen the need for certain inservice teacher programs.

7. Inservice education and preservice education could have more in common than is recognized. If preservice education has the initial responsibility for the "making of a teacher," it must be closely articulated with inservice education. That planners of inservice education programs know more about the preservice education of teachers than university professors know about the education of inservice teachers hardly speaks well of university professors. This, in itself, is probably an indicator of the lack of preparation in preservice programs for the "real world." However, there is hope and some evidence that certain types of inservice education programs presumably will be needed less in the future if the university is sensitive to the needs of practitioners and institutes learning experiences on the preservice level to address the needs prior to their incipiency in the professional life of a practitioner, and if institutional/licensure requirements permit this to be done within a four-year program. (Some states have instituted a five-year program leading to licensure.)

8. What teachers get by way of inservice education might not be what they want and/or need. The Teacher Center legislation signed by President Ford in 1976, as an Amendment to the Higher Education Act, might represent more than just the democratizing of the planning for and implementation of inservice education. Inservice education programs in the future might well be largely the results of the thinking, planning, execution, and evaluation of teachers themselves by themselves and for themselves. With the increasing pressure exerted politically by the practicing profession, state and federal laws effecting public school teachers will become more and more an expression of teacher needs as perceived (felt) by them and a legal mandate to their resolution. To the extent that this becomes an actuality, to that extent will the frequency/nature/content of inservice education programs become the resonance of legal statute. That the above would create other problems is well documented in the implementation of some federal/state statutes.

9. During a period of "adequate teacher supply" in many instructional areas, faculty expertise at the university could well be more fully released and directed toward improving existing preservice education programs and assisting in field-based inservice education programs. To do the latter (assuming the assistance is wanted/accepted), will necessitate in many instances staff development

of university faculty members by educational practitioners. That resistance will be displayed by some faculty is to be expected. That renewed vitality, and in some instances, survival of university based teacher education programs warrant overcoming the resistance is the choice.